

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated May 14, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 14, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAY 14 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-11 remain in the application. Claim 1 has been amended.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1-3, 7, 10, and 11 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Eitel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,133,543) (hereinafter "Eitel") under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found in Figs. 3 and 4 of the instant application.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claim 1 calls for, *inter alia*:

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated May 14, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 14, 2007

the ventilation openings in the feed table being in direct contact with the through openings in the suction belt.

The Eitel reference discloses openings (21-24) disposed in the bottom of the suction chambers (14 and 16). The openings (21-24) are not in direct contact with the openings (7) in the belt. Therefore, Eitel does not disclose ventilation openings in the feed table that are in direct contact with through openings in the suction belt.

As seen from the above given remarks, the reference does not show the ventilation openings in the feed table being in direct contact with the through openings in the suction belt, as recited in claim 1 of the instant application.

Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 2, 3, and 7 are believed to be allowable as well.

It is appreciatively noted from the first paragraph on page 3 of the Office action that claims 4-6 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The claims have not been amended as indicated by the Examiner, as the claims are believed to be patentable in their existing form.

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated May 14, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 14, 2007

It is appreciatively noted from the second paragraph on page 3 of the Office action that claim 9 is allowed.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claim 1. Claim 1 is, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claim 1, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-8, 10, and 11 are solicited.


In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/785,123
Amdt. dated May 14, 2007
Reply to Office action of March 14, 2007

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Sterner LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,


For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

May 14, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Sterner LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101